Ham-Policy Digest   Tue, 30 Mar 93   Volume 93 : Issue   80

Today's Topics:
                     Another 3rd Party Question
                  ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032 (3 msgs)
                            Autopatch
                Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines (2 msgs)
                     The no-code issue (4 msgs)

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

My fiance' is traveling to France this summer, and Im not looking forward
to receiving the outrageous phone bills that await me. My question aobut
third party is this:

How come since before W.W. 1, the United States has been great allies with
both the French as well as the British, and there is NO 3rd party agreement?
I mean, we are supposed to be the "best of buddies" right? You know, lots
of trading, and tourism, and the such. What is the deal here? Is this some
sort of governmental red tape or what? Isnt Isreal the nearest 3rd party
country to us in Europe? I would seem to think after the many nights of
sitting in front of the television, and seeing what seems to be the
deterioration of "pals" between the U.S.'s policies and some of the European
comunities policies, we as hams, could get another European 3rd party country.

What is the process? I speak with British hams all the time, whats to
hurt if i send traffic to a friend in England, thats not a ham. Am i
not supposed to reveal matters of military intelligence?

Help!

Charlie

Date: 29 Mar 93 14:12:54 EST
From: usc!wupost!uhog.mit.edu!eddie.mit.edu!news.intercon.com!psinntp!
arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jreese@NeoSoft.com (Jim Reese) writes:
>Does the ARRL support the position that the originating station should bear
>the responsibility for content, and that the forwarding station should not
>have to read every message?

The League hasn't yet taken a position on the matter. (We just received
the NPRM here at HQ about two hours ago.) The comment period for the
NPRM expires July 1, and no doubt the ARRL will file comments.

That would imply to me that now would be a good time to discuss this
matter with your division Director to share your views! (See p 8 of any
recent QST if you're not sure how to contact your Director.)

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: 29 Mar 93 14:26:20 EST
From: usc!wupost!uhog.mit.edu!eddie.mit.edu!news.intercon.com!psinntp!
arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 32 ARLB032
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>
>Joe Jarrett, K5FOG, and Tom Blackwell, N5GAR, submitted a petition for
>rulemaking right after the original brouhaha saying, in effect, that. (They

>actually said that the originating station - be it packet, an FM repeater
>user, or someone else in a similar situation - should be primarily
>responsible, and others who retransmit should be secondarily responsible.

This NPRM (PR Docket 93-85) is in response to that petition, among others.
I'm not sure if that was clear previously.

Note, too, that Bulletin 32 said "Docket 93-154" in error. The Docket
is 93-85; the *document number* is 93-154. Use "93-85" in any comments
you may file.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League | Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St. | I like. Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

In article <1993Mar26.215952.7977@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com writes:
>|> >>ORIGINATING A MESSAGE AND THE LICENSEE OF THE FIRST FORWARDING
>   ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>|> >>STATION PRIMARILY ACCOUNTABLE FOR VIOLATIVE COMMUNICATIONS.
>   ^^^^^^^
>
>Hmm. A good start, but this seems to assume PBBSes. This is
>shortsighted. What about a network that just relays packets, with the
>users providing their own mail hosts?
>
>Only the originating station should be accountable, and no other.
>
>Phil
>
Phil, didnt you write a program that would seem to kinda resemble that?
What was it? NOS, and whats the mode? TCP/IP? Shhhhhhhh, maybe everyone
else hasnt quite discovered 'em yet. Let 'em wait, too much congestion
now!

Charlie

===
| Charles Morrison | cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu | These are my views, |

```
| KI5XP                | ki5xp@ucs.usl.edu     | NOT anyone elses!     |
| U. of SouthWestern   | ki5xp@ki5xp.aara.org  | But who cares?        |
|       La.            | KI5XP @ K5ARH.LA      |                       |
| Lafayette, La 70506  |                       |                       |
========================================================================
```

Date: 29 Mar 1993 16:26:25 GMT
From: ucsd.edu!brian@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Autopatch
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The rules used to specify that the identification had to be 'clearly
audible through the repeated communication'. Has that section been
dropped lately? (My current rules are at home and I'm not.)

My remote has been using a synthesized voice ID for more than 10 years
now. It's not that unusual, although it was back then.

One of the kludgier repeater controllers I've seen sends the ID at like
1803 Hz, and has notch filters in it for that frequency on all the link
receiver inputs. That way you only get to hear one ID - the closest.
What the notch filters do to the repeated audio apparently isn't
considered important.

Now with a PCM-highway audio switching system, you could easily notch
out the IDer tone without all kinds of phase weirdnesses, and it's a
good chance no one would notice. I wonder how well you could notch out
the damn touchtone musicians?
     - Brian

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 1993 18:24:02 GMT
From: qualcom.qualcomm.com!servo.qualcomm.com!karn@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:
>If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
>
>Greg. KD6KGW
>
>:-)

You may think you're joking, but ...

A few weeks ago I returned somebody's phone call with a call to his
Skypager. A few minutes he called back. I heard a rather high
background noise level and wondered about it until he explained that
he was calling me from an airplane, presumably using the GTE Airphone.

Phil

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 1993 19:25:36 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!newsaintmail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:
> goldstein,marvin (mgsail@prefect.cc.bellcore.com) wrote:
> : Quick question: If a Pager (Beeper) is a radio receiver, does
> : it use an oscillator circuit? Are these allowed to be turned on on an
> : airplane?
> :
>
> If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
>
> Greg. KD6KGW
>
> :-)

Flush the &^%*!@$% beeper down the toilet.
Come to think of it, that's not a bad idea at any time.

-M

Date: 29 Mar 93 14:47:35 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Why does everybody WHINE WHINE WHINE about the code??? Just do it and
>quit WHINING! Don't be so lazy! Code separates the ham operators from
>the CBers! Cut the crap and just do it!
>   73's DE KA2OWM

Brian -

you know we've had an amateur radio no-code license since 2/14/91, right?

73, bill

Date: 29 Mar 93 18:05:56 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!hri.com!noc.near.net!saturn.caps.maine.edu!
maine.maine.edu!io10356@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

No-coders have to learn twice as much technical material, and there's
no difference between the two except one doesn't transmit on code
frequencies. And remember, the no-coder may know twice as much as you
who think you are superior because you do know it.

JR

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 93 20:54:00 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!tik.vtt.fi!funic!
oh1ltm@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <228.368.uupcb@twwells.com> brian.berkes%pics@twwells.com (Brian Berkes)
writes:

>Why does everybody WHINE WHINE WHINE about the code??? Just do it and
>quit WHINING! Don't be so lazy! Code separates the ham operators from
>the CBers! Cut the crap and just do it!

    During the (no)code bashing I've noticed that the ones who do
    the whining are mainly those Old Timers who are afraid of new
    people joining the ham world. You're right in one thing,
    though - the requirement of knowing code separates real hams
    (=those with ham spirit) from others (=those without). And
    just guess, which group the code requirers seem to belong to..

    Esa OH1LTM
--

Esa Holmberg OH1LTM oh1ltm@nic.funet.fi ekho@ttl.fi Elisa: Holmberg Esa TTL
X.400: C=fi, A=elisa, O=ttl, PN=esa holmberg   fax: +358 21 501 330 (Diana)
------------------ Turku TelCo, Finland -- (921) 621 211 ------------------

----

Date: 30 Mar 1993 04:41:20 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!bobw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The no-code issue
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

IO10356@MAINE.MAINE.EDU writes:
> No-coders have to learn twice as much technical material, and there's
> no difference between the two except one doesn't transmit on code
> frequencies. And remember, the no-coder may know twice as much as you
> who think you are superior because you do know it.
>
> JR

   The last time I checked, the no-code Tech and the coded Tech require
   the same exams and the same technical material. And the difference
   between the two operating privileges includes phone on 10 meters.

 Bob Witte / HP Colo Springs / bobw@col.hp.com   / KB0CY

Date: 29 Mar 1993 20:12:51 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar28.223950.29977@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1p77vh$1lu@network.ucsd.edu>, <1993Mar29.180403.29272@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>?
Subject : Re: Autopatch

> Talking repeaters make me want to look for the "shut up, Juliet!" button.

All you have to do is key up on her and she'll revert to her introverted
morse code shell.

-Ron

Date: Mon, 29 Mar 93 18:04:03 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1294@arrl.org>, <1993Mar28.223950.29977@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>,
<1p77vh$1lu@network.ucsd.edu>ynar
Subject : Re: Autopatch

In article <1p77vh$1lu@network.ucsd.edu> brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:
>The rules used to specify that the identification had to be 'clearly
>audible through the repeated communication'. Has that section been
>dropped lately? (My current rules are at home and I'm not.)

I remembered that specific section, too; that was what prompted my initial
search.

>My remote has been using a synthesized voice ID for more than 10 years
>now. It's not that unusual, although it was back then.

Talking repeaters make me want to look for the "shut up, Juliet!" button.

>One of the kludgier repeater controllers I've seen sends the ID at like
>1803 Hz, and has notch filters in it for that frequency on all the link
>receiver inputs. That way you only get to hear one ID - the closest.
>What the notch filters do to the repeated audio apparently isn't
>considered important.

...and it's that effect that I dislike, too, that led me on this search. What
we _really_ need is a DSP chip that you could feed audio in one side and get
repeat audio with a black hole for one particular frequency in it, and PL
decode while we're at it.
Too bad DSP requires an MSEE to do.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
 "I can understand if it just won't work but I think locking up my system
         to tell me this is a little excessive." -- Steve Luzynski

----

Date: Tue, 30 Mar 1993 07:24:40 GMT
From: usc!wupost!darwin.sura.net!rouge!cfm1471@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Mar25.213416.25117@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com>, <1993Mar29.182402.13255@qualcomm.com>
Subject : Re: Beepers (Pagers) on Airlines

In article <1993Mar29.182402.13255@qualcomm.com> karn@servo.qualcomm.com (Phil
Karn) writes:
>In article <C4ItG2.sJ@icon.rose.hp.com> greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas)
writes:
>>If someone managed to beep you at 30,000 feet, what would you *do*?
>>

```
>>Greg.  KD6KGW
>>
>>:-)
>
>You may think you're joking, but ...
>
>A few weeks ago I returned somebody's phone call with a call to his
>Skypager. A few minutes he called back. I heard a rather high
>background noise level and wondered about it until he explained that
>he was calling me from an airplane, presumably using the GTE Airphone.
>
>Phil
>
GEE,  NO!  GTE!
>

------------------------------

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #80
******************************
```